

longitudinal axis of the central frame portion at an angle of approximately 35 degrees. It has been found, after much experimentation, that the placement of the pivotal supports for the lever arms on opposite sides of the central frame portion and the angling of the pivots so the arms are angled away from the longitudinal axis of the central frame portion at approximately 35 degrees makes for a vastly improved operation; namely this allows the user's arms to move upwardly in an arcuate manner which is the natural manner that one's arms move over one's head. This makes for highly improved exercising with natural arm, wrist and shoulder movement while performing a Bench press, Shoulder press, Decline press and Incline press. The devices of the prior art are not capable of such operation, as now to be pointed out.

Applicant's claims have been rejected as fully met or obvious over the Voris patent. Voris discloses an exercise device in which the pivots for the two lever arms are in the same straight line about in line pivots which is in a straight line for the user... There is no suggestion of angling the two pivots relative to each other at about 35 degrees. The arms in Voris thus do not travel in an arcuate manner as taught and claimed by Applicant. Further, in Voris the pivot arms need a handle that rotates 180 degrees to keep the user from turning his or her hands 90 degrees from the starting position.. Thus, the Voris device neither teaches nor suggests the basic features of Applicant's claimed invention and is incapable of achieving Applicant's operation or end results. Applicant's claims are therefore believed to be clearly allowable over this reference.

The claims have further been rejected over Danylieko in view of Snyderman, et al. Danylieko discloses an exercise machine in which the pivot arms are pivoted at a 90 degree angle from the user. Snyderman has been cited solely as against the seat portions

of applicant's device and not insofar as the angling of the lever arms is concerned. As pointed out above, the structure of the seat portions is not the basic feature of Applicant's claimed invention. The rejection over Danylieko is apparently based on the Examiner's contention that there is nothing novel in Applicant's claimed invention because Applicant has not shown that 35 degrees provides a particular advantage or solves a stated problem. In Danylieko's device the arms are pivoted at a 90 degree angle from the user. There no suggestion of employing a 35 degree angle or any angle close to this.

To verify the radically improved operation with the angling of the lever arms at about 35 degrees, as asserted above, in achieving an optimum arcuate path for the lever arms a Declaration of the inventor is enclosed

The drawings and specification have been corrected as required. And corrected copies enclosed.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, If the Examiner has any questions with regard to this amendment or suggestions for further amendment, it would be appreciated if he would telephone applicant's attorney to that such matters can be expeditiously resolved

Respectfully Submitted



Edward A. Sokolski  
Attorney for Applicant  
3868 Carson Street, ste. 105  
Torrance, CA 90503  
Phone-(310) 540-5631  
Fax-(310)-540-2699

Date 12/1/03